MINUTES

Second Annual Convention

of the

Association of History Teachers

of the

Middle States and Maryland

Held at

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

March 11 and 12, 1904

MINUTES

Second Annual Convention

of the

Association of History Teachers

of the

Middle States and Maryland

Held at

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

March 11 and 12, 1904

The Knickerbocker Press
New York

123667

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/annual-proceedings-and-bulletin-mscss_1904_2

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL, 1903–4

President
LUCY M. SALMON
Vassar College

Vice-President
F. S. EDMONDS
Central High School, Philadelphia

Secretary-Treasurer
E. H. CASTLE
Teachers College, Columbia University

Assistant-Secretary
A. C. HOWLAND
Teachers College, Columbia University

H. V. AMES
University of Pennsylvania

EUGENE W. LYTTLE
Regents' Office, Albany

W. H. MACE
Syracuse University

J. H. VAN SICKLE
Baltimore

JULIUS SACHS
Teachers College, Columbia University

ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE next annual meeting of the Association will be held at the Washington Square buildings of New York University, New York City, March 10 and 11, 1905. The program includes a paper on the history curriculum in the grammar schools, the second report of the committee engaged upon the history curriculum in the secondary schools, and a discussion of the relation of history and geography by Professor Stevenson of Rutgers College, and Professor Brigham of Colgate University. A more detailed statement will be sent in January to any who may desire it.

Suggestions concerning the work of the Association will be welcomed by the officers of the Association.

Membership in the Association entitles one to the minutes and to all announcements. By order of the Council an extra large edition of the minutes has been printed. Members and superintendents and principals of schools who desire the minutes in quantity may obtain them at cost so long as the edition lasts.

All persons interested in the study or teaching of history may become members of the Association upon payment of the annual fee of one dollar.

MINUTES

The Second Annual Convention was called to order by President Lucy M. Salmon at 2.30 o'clock, Friday afternoon, March 11, 1904, in Houston Hall of the University of Pennsylvania.

After a few cordial words of welcome to the University and its hospitality by the Vice-Provost, Edgar F. Smith, Ph.D., Sc.D., the President spoke briefly as follows:

THE WORK OF THE ASSOCIATION

The wise man whose observation led him to realize that of making many books there is no end would to-day be absorbed in the contemplation of the many associations that spring up by day and by night, and threaten to exceed in number the products of the press.

But organization is not new, although its recent development has been most rapid. The church, very early in its history, began to develop systematic co-operation in its work. Politics have been organized with the progress of universal suffrage. The organization of industry has been one of the phenomena of our own days, while education, always a laggard, has later fallen into line. Not only masses of men, but even individuals as individuals, are organized.

The lecturer is managed by a bureau; the author is surrounded by stenographers, secretaries, copyists, and mimeographers; the preacher is syndicated and gramophoned; the scholar, whom literature once depicted as burning the midnight oil in solitude, has become the man of affairs, who makes after-dinner speeches and attends committee meetings and smokers.

The individual has indeed apparently ceased to work single-handed and alone, and has become a cog, a wheel, a larger or a smaller part of a great machine. As each year he is pressed to join new associations, as each year his dues increase in number and sometimes in amount, as his time is more and more absorbed by meetings and conferences, a sense of helplessness comes over him, and he feels that he is borne on by a current he is powerless to resist.

When, then, a new association presses itself on the attention of those who already feel the burden of membership in existing organizations, well may the cry arise, "Cui bono"!

An answer to this question is possible only through an inquiry into the condition of history teaching in this country, before the development of organized effort.

It is just twenty-one years ago that the first co-operative attempt was made to improve the teaching of history in America. It was in 1883 that President, then Professor G. Stanley Hall, who had undertaken the editorship of a pedagogical library, stated that history was chosen for the subject of the initial volume because, after much observation in the schoolrooms of many of the larger cities in the eastern part of the country, he was convinced that no subject so widely taught, was, on the whole, taught so poorly. The volume published comprised a translation of Diesterweg's *Methods of Teaching History* with additional chapters contributed by six distinguished university professors or writers of history.

It was the beginning in this country of co-operative work in the study of the teaching of history, and as such is entitled to lasting memory, even though the work is half forgotten; and it is at least a question whether any of the contributing writers would to-day give the same content to his article as that which he gave it twenty-one years ago.

The appearance of Diesterweg has been followed by that of the great classics on the subject,—Freeman, Bernheim, Altamira, Langlois and Seignobos, and Letelier. These in turn have been the precursors of a large number of works of a somewhat less permanent character,—all dealing with the nature of history and its treatment in the lecture-room. These have been indeed, with a single exception, the result of individual, rather than of co-operative effort, but they show an awakened interest in the study of history and an appreciation of its importance.

It was the spirit of co-operation that led to the conference of the Committee of Ten at the University of Wisconsin eleven years ago, and that led to the subsequent Columbia Conference and to the appointment of the Committee of Seven. It has been the interest in history, awakened in part by the reports of these and other committees, that has led to co-operative work in the formation of the association of the history teachers of New England and of the North Central States; of Nebraska, California, and of Indiana; of Chicago and of New York City; and to our own Association of the Middle States and Maryland. Underneath all of these organizing efforts there is found the same principle of federation that has characterized our political system, and through which all that is best in our political life has been accomplished. Isolated individual effort is the ineffective centrifugal force, the concentration of all effort in one person is the overmastering centripetal force—the balancing of these centrifugal and centripetal forces through co-operation results in that perfect circle which is the aim of all educational organization.

What have been the fruits of these past years of united work?

A consistent, logical course in history has been planned for the secondary schools, and it has been already widely adopted. In the place of detached isolated courses given haphazard in unchronological order, we have a course based on the theory that history is the study of developments.

A natural result of this has been the practical adoption of uniform requirements for admission to college, and this in turn has made possible the adoption of the system of uniform entrance examination questions. Thus history has been accorded a permanent place in the curriculum, and, if the classicists and scientists could but realize that history does not supplant the older subjects, but serves as a unifying force to make the curriculum an organic whole, a more hearty welcome would be given the new-comer.

It was but natural that those who blazed the path for the better teaching of history in the secondary schools, who made the tools with which they cleared the way for their colleagues as well as for their successors, should sometimes have felled a tree that ought to have remained, and should have reached an end somewhat distant from that anticipated. In the first reaction from the slavish use of the text-book that characterized the early period of history teaching, the text-book was thrown aside and immature pupils were put at tasks that might well have staggered experienced historians. But the discussion of twenty years, over the question of whether the text-book method or the source method should be used in the secondary schools has resulted in inestimable benefit. The text-book has been restored, but not to its old place. It no longer serves to stimulate the flagging memory of the teacher, who follows the history lesson with his finger on the line of the text; but it serves as the skeleton which the teacher is to clothe with flesh and blood. Sources have not taken the place of the text-book, but they are used to illustrate, not to reconstruct history. One of the greatest gains of the discussions of the past twenty years has been the clarification of our ideas in regard to the relation to each other of sources and text-books.

A more intelligent appreciation of the value of the text-book as an aid in the study of history has led to a demand for its improvement. Recent years have seen effective protests against "fourteen weeks in the history of the world" series, and the substitution for them of tests written by those who are at once distinguished scholars and experienced teachers. Moreover, in our own association we have had the best formulation yet given of the fundamental principles that should govern the preparation of a text-book in history. With these high ideals in

theory and in practice it seems impossible that we should ever degenerate into using the ready-to-wear text-book, with its minute instructions to teachers, and its lack of both historical fact and historical perspective. This gain has been a welcome result of conference and co-operation.

The substitution of the study of history for the reading of history, the introduction of the comparative method, the development of the science of historical criticism, have all combined to create a demand for a more scientific equipment. This demand has been met, as well as in part created, by scholars who have worked in different bibliographical fields. The monumental work done by Professor Gross for English history, by Mr. Larned and his board of co-operators for American history, the valuable bibliography of the study and teaching of history, prepared by Mr. J. I. Wyer of the University of Nebraska, as well as other similar works on a less extended scale, have all given invaluable help to the teacher of history. No more important step in the development of historical study is seen than in the substitution of bibliography for chronology as the handmaid of history.

History itself has come to have a history, and at least two important histories have appeared within fifteen years. Yet so rapidly have changes come in the point of view of historians themselves that in a history of historical writing in America, written less than fifteen years ago, the names of the American historians most honored to-day are mentioned, if at all, with but incidental allusion.

The past twenty years have indeed been years of plenty, not only by comparison with the lean years that had preceded them, but also as regards their net results. So much has indeed been done that the insistent questions may well be asked—Why another association? What remains to be done?

It may be said that the work thus far accomplished has been somewhat along the line of self-instruction. History has so recently come into the curriculum that the principles as yet deduced, in connection with its teaching, have been formulated by those still actively in the field. We ourselves believe in our subject, and we have come to agree on certain fundamentals in regard to studying and teaching it. But others have yet to be convinced, and one of the first important duties of our associa-

tion should be to press on the attention of those having the appointing power, that an essential qualification of those whom they select to teach history should be some knowledge of the subject to be taught. The protest against present conditions is not superfluous; current announcements show that one ambitious school, in one of the most famous New England towns, has a teacher who gives instruction in music, painting, drawing, biology, and history; that in one large city high school the classes in history are heard by the musical critic of one of the daily papers; that, in another, history has been assigned to the general utility man. If we ourselves have learned any thing as teachers of history, it is that we cannot teach what we do not ourselves know; but the public has not yet learned this elemental truth, and no one thing would do more to advance the cause of history teaching in this country than an understanding of this fact.

A second line of work that needs to be taken up is a consideration of the relation between a consistent course of history in the general secondary schools and that given in college preparatory schools. A large number of schools now have a well-arranged course in history, yet this is made of no effect for its college preparatory class, through the increase in the language requirements made by the colleges, and the regulation requiring all college entrance examinations to be taken within two years prior to admission to college. The schools cannot square the circle, they cannot give a course in ancient history during the first year in the high school, where it logically comes, and yet have the work examined by the colleges within two years of entrance. No better service could be rendered the cause of historical teaching than a presentation to colleges and schools of a satisfactory solution of this very real difficulty.

Another line of work is the consideration of the relation between history in the classroom and the various outside lights thrown upon its study by historical excursions, historical museums, lantern slides, individual collections of photographs, and similar activities.

These are but suggestions of some of the superficial aspects of history as regards methods of instruction.

But there is more than one vital question yet unanswered by either college or school, as to the content of history teaching. Is the subject-matter taught to be selected mainly from patriotic

considerations, and is patriotism to be defined as "my country, right or wrong, my country"; or, again, in the words of Samuel Johnson, as "the last refuge of a scoundrel"? Is truth to be the object of history teaching, or the virtues of a protective tariff, the wisdom of tariff for revenue only, the importance of the sea-power, or the dangers threatening us from all the powers of the world? Is the study of history to be an end in itself, or is it to be the handmaid of legislators, anxious to turn to account every means for furthering their own ends; of ecclesiastics, who would utilize its facts to enforce ethical lessons; of business men whose interests are promoted by the study of the history of industries? Is the teacher of history to keep in mind that "far-off, divine event to which the whole creation moves," or that equally remote event from which creation has sprung?

But not only has an association of history teachers a wide field for work in the study of unsettled questions of methods of instruction and of the content of history teaching,—it has a still wider field opening out to it in the determining the relations it sustains to the various communities of which its members are a part. It rests with us to arouse an interest in the study of history in our home communities, to seek the co-operation of the public library, to show the importance of preserving historical material, to suggest the founding of historical museums, to enlist interest in the records of civic life. The historian and the teacher of history cannot be a recluse, he has never been such. In every age, from the times of Herodotus and Thucydides and Xenophon to those of Von Holst and Mommsen, Stubbs and Bryce, Lavisse and Aulard, Motley and Bancroft, Hay and White, Mahan and Lea, the historian has been a man of affairs, a publicist, a diplomat, a legislator, a business man,—always in one profession or another an active member of society. Removed by virtue of his subject from the realm of speculation and abstract theory, from that of experimentation and empiricism, the writer and teacher of history must always keep his feet on solid ground, he must always maintain his connection with the past. But if he is to study the life of a previous age, he must have established relations with his own. "Brains, knowledge of men, insight into things political and social, are the indispensable qualities for the historian," says Frederick Harrison. It must therefore devolve on us, as an association, to keep in touch with

the life about us, to hold ourselves always ready to promote, in any way possible, the interests of historical study in all of its ramifications in our own communities.

If, therefore, as students and teachers of history we are interested through membership in this association in working for improvements in the teaching of history, in determining the field of historical study, in allying ourselves with the historical interests of our own localities,—must we not turn the question upon ourselves and ask what are to be our personal relations to the new association? To this question there can be but one answer,—the association belongs to us, to every individual working co-operatively with every other individual. It cannot be stated with too great emphasis that the association does not belong to its officers. We get from any organization what we put into it; if we put into it our fees, we get out of it reports; if we put into it earnest work, we get from it large interest on the capital invested.

Pressing home, then, a final question, we must ask what contribution we, as teachers, are personally making towards what Principal Caird has called "the other and higher function of extending the bounds of knowledge." Professor Villari has written of Mansilio Ficino, "His mind was so thoroughly saturated with learning as to become incapable of independent thought"; and in every educational organization we ourselves find Dr. Casaubons with multifarious learning without productivity. If, then, the new association is to justify its existence, it can do so only through the personal efforts of its individual members, whose aim it is to be active, not passive, members; to be producers, not merely intellectual sponges; to invest much in the association with the expectation of realizing largely on the investment.

To an association thus constituted we may apply the words of William Penn: "Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them, and as governments are made and moved by men, so by them they are ruined too. Wherefore governments rather depend upon men than men upon governments. Let men be good, and the government cannot be bad; if it be ill, they will cure it. But if men be bad, let the government be never so good, they will endeavor to warp and spoil it to their turn."

Prof. Charles H. Haskins, of Harvard University, then read the following paper:

THE HISTORICAL CURRICULUM IN COLLEGES

The nature and sequence of the historical studies to be pursued in college constitute, at first sight, a distinct and well-defined subject of discussion. More attentive consideration, however, will show that, as is usually the case, this topic is closely bound up with a number of others. It is not possible, for example, to reach satisfactory conclusions as to what we shall study without considering why and how we shall study, so that questions concerning the content of historical instruction inevitably lead to questions involving its method and purpose. Furthermore, the historical curriculum in any particular institution is in large measure determined by the general course of study, the problem varying according as we are dealing with an elective curriculum, a prescribed course, or a group system, and in regard to these matters the practice of American colleges seems hopelessly at variance. Then, too, the college program of studies in history depends in an increasing degree upon the historical curriculum of the secondary school and also conditions the historical work of the graduate school; indeed in the present transitional stage of educational organization in America there is a constant overlapping of these three grades of institutions, so that it is exceedingly difficult and sometimes impossible to draw a sharp line of demarcation between the different grades of instruction. However closely we seek to limit ourselves, however much we take for granted, we shall still find that no thoroughgoing discussion of the historical curriculum is possible which does not consider a large number of related topics. Fortunately, however, an exhaustive or definitive treatment of the theme is not now called for. The historical curriculum is still in process of evolution, and its final form is not yet discernible. Indeed, strictly speaking, there is no historical curriculum, for every college is working at its own problems in its own way; and where conditions vary so widely and experimentation is proving so fruitful, uniformity of practice is neither desirable nor attainable.

A generation ago there was little or no systematic instruction

in history in American colleges, and what there was could certainly not be dignified with the name of an historical curriculum. The course of study of that time aimed to cover in some fashion the whole range of human knowledge and to give a general view of every important subject. In so comprehensive a plan there was obviously small room for history, and if history was taught at all it was universal history of a very compendious sort. A term or two of a book like Swinton's *Outlines* or Freeman's *General Sketch*, a term in the senior year devoted to Guizot's *History of Civilization*, perhaps another term on the Constitution of the United States, may be taken as representing fairly the amount of time given to history in most of our institutions of learning. Often the body of instruction was much less; the late Herbert Adams used to say that when he was a student at Amherst the course in history, except as the subject was treated in connection with the classics, consisted of one lecture given by the president toward the close of the senior year on the philosophy of history. Professorships of history scarcely existed, indeed could hardly be justified by so meagre a body of instruction.

How all this has been changed is a matter of familiar knowledge. Various influences have had their share—the breakdown of the traditional curriculum, the example of European schools, the historical spirit of the age, the growth of the civic sense, and so on,—until to-day every reputable college has at least one professor of history and a fair offering of historical courses, while the largest of our historical departments have as many as eight or nine instructors whose whole time is given to history. The problems of the historical curriculum are obviously somewhat different in large and in small departments, yet certain fundamental questions are sure to arise in every college, and it is to these common matters that our attention may most profitably be directed.

In our day and generation every undergraduate has a right to demand of his college the opportunity to get a systematic course of instruction in the history of the world at large and of his own country. Whether this shall be made an obligation as well as an opportunity by requiring a certain amount of historical study on his part, is a question that depends largely upon the extent to which the college lays down specific requirements for

its students; but if any subjects are to be prescribed it is difficult to see why history should not be one of them. The main point, however, is that a substantial body of historical instruction should be offered, and that any student who so desires should be left free to follow a prolonged course of historical study. All will not desire extended work in history, but it may be asserted in general that all students ought to have some history, most ought to have a good deal, and some ought to be encouraged to specialize in this department.

Historical study in college ought to begin not later than the sophomore year, as the great majority of colleges now permit, and, especially in view of the small amount of historical training which most students have had in school, there is no valid reason why history may not be taken in the freshman year. This is now possible at several representative institutions, such as Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, Columbia, Cornell, Johns Hopkins, the University of Pennsylvania, Vassar, Wellesley, Smith, Bryn Mawr, Western Reserve, Tulane, the University of Chicago, Leland Stanford, and the universities of Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, Texas, and California. It is, of course, easier to arrange for freshman work in history under an elective or group system than under a system of prescribed freshman studies, where the competition of departments for a place on the freshman program is unusually keen, but it is noteworthy that the institutions which do not permit their students to begin history at the opening of the college course are generally those which give small recognition to history as an entrance subject.

The range and variety of the historical instruction offered in colleges will naturally depend in large measure upon the available teaching force. It may be taken for granted that courses should be provided in ancient history, the history of the Middle Ages and of modern Europe, English history, and American history; and even a single professor can, as far as the number of hours of teaching is concerned, by proper arrangement and alternations find time for giving all these subjects. How far courses in these various fields may profitably be multiplied and subdivided is a matter which each institution must decide for itself, provided always that it remains possible for the ordinary undergraduate to get a fairly satisfactory survey of the general

field of history without devoting an unreasonable amount of time to the subject. I am aware that in recent years there has been a large introduction into the undergraduate curriculum of the necessarily special and often technical courses of the graduate school—that one university actually offers to its undergraduates nine separate courses on the works of Victor Hugo, that another opens to them twenty-nine courses in what it calls sociology, and that stray courses on Roman lamps or the Chinese alphabet, on the play instinct and the pedagogy of the Gospels, may reward the curious perusal of college catalogues—; but I cannot see that departments of history have as yet suffered seriously from such vagaries. There is a large range of subjects of great historical importance and profound human interest in which courses may profitably be given to undergraduates, and it is highly desirable that students should have an opportunity to supplement their more general and necessarily rapid courses by deeper acquaintance with some significant period or set of institutions—by some more "intensive study," if that phrase is preferred. What subjects are offered matters little, provided they are really significant and are treated in a large way. The Roman Empire, the Renaissance, the Reformation, the Stuart period in England, the rise of Prussia, the French Revolution, the history of colonization, the era of reconstruction, the diplomatic history of the United States,—these are examples of a great number of subjects which are entirely suited to the purposes of undergraduate instruction, if the instructor is competent and the library facilities are adequate. After the fundamental general courses in the great fields of history have been provided, the choice of these more special subjects should be determined largely by the training and tastes of the instructor. If a man's heart is in the Renaissance, let him seek to fill his students with the Renaissance, and not try to pump up interest in fields which he finds uncongenial.

The development of "historical-mindedness" involves the training of the judgment and the critical sense, as well as the stimulating of the imagination and the widening of the sympathies; and if, toward the close of his undergraduate course, the serious student can have the benefit of a seminary or practice course in history, so much the better. "The nature of the historical method is to understand by investigation," says Droysen,

and the senior year is none too early to learn this by actual experience. To face an historical problem squarely, to sift the materials carefully, and to draw one's own conclusions from a careful examination of the available body of evidence, is not only sound historical method, but most valuable general training. Of course, a well-trained student will have learned something of the nature and uses of historical sources long before his senior year, but in a special course it is possible for him to go farther and really work some limited subject to the bottom, and by standing for once on the solid ground of contemporary evidence take a long step toward intellectual independence. Such work need not be original research, but it ought to be independent study. A field should be selected for which the material, while sufficient and varied, is not beyond the student's powers, either as regards its difficulty or its amount, and such topics chosen as afford a real insight into the period as well as into the processes of historical study.

As regards the sequence of historical subjects in college, I believe that as a general principle the order of chronological development should be followed where possible, and that a general view of the field of history should ordinarily precede courses on special periods or movements. Such a view of history cannot, however, be advantageously given in a single course, but requires two or three years of consecutive study. If our students brought to college any such acquaintance with the field of history as is possessed by the graduates of German *gymnasia* or French *lycées*, they might profitably begin at once with more intensive courses, but such, unfortunately, is far from being the case. In spite of the rapid advances in historical instruction in schools, it still remains true that the average freshman carries with him but a small viaticum of historical knowledge or training, and that his acquaintance with the world's history must for the most part still be gained in college. A general view of the development of civilized life is what he has the right, first of all, to demand, only this must not be so rapid as to render impossible any real understanding of the times studied.

I am also of the opinion that historical instruction in college should be progressive, that the earlier courses should serve in method as well as in subject-matter as an introduction to the later and, within reasonable limits, be made prerequisites

for them. This principle is well recognized in other departments, and while it is true that the dependence of one field upon another is not so close in history as in most other subjects, it is also true that there is an historical way of looking at things and a training in the use of historical materials which can only be learned from historical study. This holds good independently of the particular period of history dealt with, but its force is naturally much greater if the chronological order of courses be followed. To ignore this is to miss a large part of the purpose of historical teaching, and to attempt to teach such things anew in every course involves a large amount of wasteful repetition. If our introductory courses give nothing which we desire to demand as a condition of more advanced study, so much the worse for them.

This leads to the consideration of a topic of fundamental importance in the historical curriculum, namely, the first year of college work in history. What do we seek to accomplish in the first historical course in college? Is it the acquisition of a certain modicum of general information regarding historical events and personages, or a certain number of general ideas regarding the course of history, or a certain amount of training in the use of historical material? To a certain extent all these aims are legitimate, though any one of them seems to me inadequate. Our primary purpose should be to introduce the student to the college study of history in such a way as will prepare him to go farther if he so desires, but will also give him something of substantial value in case his formal study of history stops at this point. An introductory course of this sort ought to afford a view of a large section of the world's history—a field large enough to give an idea of the growth of institutions and the nature of historical evolution, yet not so extensive as to render impossible an acquaintance at close range with some of the characteristic personalities and conditions of the times—; it should also demand a freer use of material than is possible in the secondary school, and convey some notion of the purposes and processes of historical study.

If now we turn to examine what is actually done in the introductory courses of American colleges, we find the greatest diversity prevailing. Courses in universal history, ancient history, mediæval history, general European history, English history,

recent European history, and American history all appear, either alone or in a variety of combinations. Nevertheless it is possible to reduce these to a few general types which we may briefly consider.

The best example of a course in universal history is probably that given to freshmen or sophomores at Columbia University (History A, three times a week). The scope of this course is sufficiently indicated by its title, "Epochs of ancient, mediæval, and modern history, with special reference to forms of government and changes in social conditions," the student being conducted, on the basis of a carefully prepared syllabus, from the nations of the ancient Orient to the beginning of the twentieth century. The plan of study is worked out more carefully than that of any similar course with which I am acquainted; but in spite of the great popularity which they once enjoyed in colleges, courses of this type now survive in comparatively few of the better institutions. The giving of a general survey of the world's history is an object which ought always to be kept in mind in framing an historical program, but it seems to be one of the few well-established results of the experience of college teachers of history that this cannot be profitably accomplished in a single year. The skilful teacher may do much to save such courses from becoming an arid list of names and dates on the one hand or a mass of unassimilated generalizations on the other, but the pace is inevitably too rapid to permit of satisfactory results.

If more than one year is to be spent in covering the general field of history, it would seem at first sight that the work of the first year should be devoted to ancient history. This was for long the practice at the University of Wisconsin, and still obtains at Johns Hopkins and the University of Indiana (where the group system lends itself naturally to such an arrangement), at Tulane, and at the University of Iowa, while ancient history appears as an alternative with other periods at Cornell, Wisconsin, Kansas, Smith, and Leland Stanford. While, however, a course in ancient history not only has chronological convenience in its favor, but is excellently adapted to elementary instruction by reason of its relative simplicity and the abundance of accessible material, it has never been popular as a beginners' course. Ancient history as a freshman study suffers from the fact that

it constitutes the historical preparation which most students bring to college, and hence lacks the freshness and stimulating power of less familiar fields. Moreover, it is a singular commentary upon the teaching of the classics in this country that, with all the time and money spent upon them and the special advantages which they have enjoyed, so few scholars have been produced of the type of W. F. Allen and Gurney and so little has been done to create interest in ancient history. Teachers of history have generally been deficient in technical training, and teachers of classics have been deficient in vital historical interests; and ancient history has fallen between the two. More hopeful signs have recently begun to appear, but it is still true that the condition of ancient history among us is distinctly discreditable to American scholarship.

A more popular type of introductory course consists of a general survey of the history of mediæval and modern Europe. This commonly begins with the Roman Empire or the Germanic invasions, but there is no uniformity of practice with regard to the point at which it should close. At Princeton (where the course occupies but one semester) and at Yale the end is set at 1870; at Brown, 1815; at Dartmouth and Northwestern, 1789; at Michigan and Vassar, the eighteenth century; at Wellesley and Bryn Mawr, 1648. The old introductory course at Harvard, History 1, an early example of this type, extended to the beginning of the eighteenth century. A course of this sort has many obvious merits. It takes the student on from the point which he has ordinarily reached in his preparation for college, gives him a broad view of European development, and furnishes a good basis for the subsequent study of American and later European history. But if it has many of the advantages, it has also some of the disadvantages of a course in universal history. It covers a vast extent of ground and leaves little time for assimilation or collateral work, and the results are often unsatisfactory. Accordingly, some important institutions devote the whole year to the Middle Ages, thus securing time for more thorough study and more careful training, and at the same time laying a substantial foundation for later work in the modern period and in American history. Such is now the plan followed at Cornell, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and California, and the experiment will be tried next year at Harvard.

A general course in English history is also a possibility for the first year of college work, covering as it does a long stretch of time and enabling the student to follow a significant line of historical development without the confusing complications of the Continent. Such a course existed for some time at the University of Michigan, and is still found at Vanderbilt; while it is offered as an alternative with other historical subjects at Wisconsin, California, Leland Stanford, Kansas, Bowdoin, Smith, and Wellesley. The University of Minnesota has for many years maintained a successful beginners' course devoted to the constitutional history of England to the accession of the House of Hanover, accompanied by a brief survey of continental history. It is undoubtedly possible to introduce students to European history on the English as well as on the continental side, and if sufficient attention is paid to contemporary affairs on the Continent many of the same results may be reached; but something of the largeness of the field is lost in this way, and there is always the danger of getting an insular and Anglo-centric view of history which we need especially to avoid.

Mention should also be made of the introductory course given at the University of Nebraska, although any adequate consideration of it belongs to the discussion of methods of teaching rather than of programs.[1] This course occupies four hours a week throughout the year, and is required of all students entering the department without previous training. One of these weekly hours is given to general lectures, beginning with Greek history and coming down to the close of the last century, and another hour to a systematic exposition of the methods of historical investigation. For the third hour the class is divided into sections for the study of extracts from the sources, ancient and mediæval material being used, and for the fourth hour it is cut up into groups of half a dozen for quiz. All this is accompanied by the preparation of note-books and papers and a fixed amount of work in the library, the whole being expected to require, for the majority of the students, eight hours weekly outside of the classroom. It is plain that while this is in a sense a course in universal history, its most characteristic features are the careful organization and supervision of the work, and the

[1] This account is condensed from a description of the course which Professor Fling has had the kindness to send me.

emphasis placed upon the processes of historical study rather than upon its generally accepted results; and the methods employed are equally applicable, or equally inapplicable, to any period of history.

So far we have assumed that each college shall maintain but one introductory course in history. Recently, however, a marked tendency has become manifest in some of our larger universities to offer a number of parallel courses for beginners in historical study. Thus Kansas, Leland Stanford, and Smith give both ancient and English history; Wellesley and Bowdoin, English and general European; Ohio State University, general European and American. At Cornell the courses open to freshmen comprise Oriental history, Greek and Roman, and mediæval; at Wisconsin, ancient, mediæval, English, and the history of the nineteenth century; at California, ancient, mediæval, English, and early Hebrew history; at the University of Pennsylvania, mediæval history, the nineteenth century, and three courses in American history. Besides offering a wider range of choice, such a system has the advantage of splitting up the large body of first-year students into groups of more convenient size, and permitting an easier adjustment between college and preparatory work for students who have had extensive preparatory training in history. On the other hand, it breaks down any uniformity of preparation for advanced courses, and destroys the unity and co-ordination of the historical curriculum. By admitting beginners to all courses alike, each course is kept at the elementary level, so that a student may study history for some years without really advancing, and if the attempt is made to avoid this by restricting the number of elementary courses which may be taken, it becomes impossible for the ordinary student to get a general view of history. Until our students come to college with a more comprehensive and thorough training in history than they now have, it seems unwise to give up the ideal of a progressive series of related courses.

It is certainly significant that with the exception of the alternatives offered at the University of Pennsylvania and the Ohio State University and a brief course at the University of Chicago, no college, so far as I have learned, places American history among its introductory courses, and that in a large number of institutions a course in European history is made a

prerequisite for the study of American history. In spite of wide differences in other respects, there would seem to be general agreement that some sort of a course in European history is the best introductory course for college students.

It would, no doubt, be worth while to investigate more thoroughly the practice of each institution and bring together the experience of historical departments with regard to their introductory courses, but the general summary which has been given must suffice. In the presence of so much diversity it would certainly be rash to insist that any one type of course is clearly the best. Conditions vary widely in different parts of the country and in different sorts of institutions, and the problem is becoming more complicated with the rapid extension of historical study in secondary schools, so that at the present stage of development dogmatic conclusions are peculiarly out of place. As matters stand in the colleges which I know best, my present inclination is toward a general course on the history of the Middle Ages as likely to be best adapted to the needs of the first year. It may be that I am attracted to this solution of the problem because this is almost the only type of course which I have not taught to freshmen, and that my confidence will pass away with experience; but there is much to be said for beginning with a year's work on the Middle Ages. The field is broad, but not too vast for a single course, and the student who comes to college from his preparatory study of ancient history is introduced to a new world, full of action and movement and color, and kept in touch with it long enough to get some knowledge of its characteristic life and some apprehension of its relations to the institutions and culture of modern times. It is significant that most of the introductory courses now given devote considerable time to the Middle Ages, the only points of difference being whether the emphasis shall be English or Continental and whether some or all of the modern period shall also be included.

The extent of the field to be covered in the first year's course in history depends in some degree upon the methods of teaching employed, and these in turn are in large measure conditioned by the number of students in the class. The beginning class in history is sure to be relatively large in any institution, and at Harvard and Yale it has already passed four hundred. At the same time college authorities have rarely reached the

point where they are willing to spend as much upon courses of this sort as upon elementary instruction in language, mathematics, and science, and the effective handling of large courses in history has in many places become a serious problem. I cannot discover that there is any very general satisfaction with existing methods of conducting such courses, but there seems to be a growing realization that these large classes have come to stay, and a serious effort is being made to adjust our machinery of instruction to them.

We are thus brought back to the point from which we started, namely, that it is impossible to consider what we shall teach without considering how we shall teach, or to discuss the historical curriculum without some regard to matters of general educational policy. At the same time let us beware of putting our trust in curricula or in any pedagogical devices. A good teacher with a poor curriculum is vastly better than a poor teacher with a good curriculum, and in time the good teacher's curriculum is likely to improve. History is larger than the most comprehensive course of study, and its influence upon the students of our colleges ought to be much wider than our formal historical instruction. That one lecture of President Seelye to the Amherst seniors proved of more value than many courses, for it decided Herbert Adams to devote his life to the study of history, and thus indirectly affected all who came under his fructifying influence. Inspiration is a large element in good historical teaching, and an important part of our function as college teachers of history will be left undone unless we encourage our students to read liberally, stimulate them to do something for themselves beyond what is required, and develop in them some abiding interest in historical studies. Courses are good, but history is better.

Prof. Marshall S. Brown, of New York University, opened the discussion. He said:

It is impossible to study the catalogues of representative colleges of our section of the country without being impressed by the fact that there is a decided absence of a consensus of opinion and practice as to the place of history in these colleges.

Wishing to ascertain what the present practice is, I have examined the catalogues of twenty-one colleges of the Middle

States and Maryland, including in the number small and medium-sized colleges, as well as the college departments of the great universities. Of these twenty-one colleges, seventeen require the student to take some history in order to fully qualify for the bachelor's degree, while in four the degree may be obtained without any history.

Four of these institutions make history a prescribed course in the freshman year, while eleven make it possible for the student to begin the study of history in that year. Of this number several of the smaller colleges make no provision for the continued study of the subject throughout the four years of the college course; in at least one case no history is given after the sophomore year. Ten of the twenty-one have no courses in history open to freshmen; six of these ten allow or require the student to begin its study in the sophomore year, while four make no provision for historical courses before the junior year.

There is a similar lack of conformity as to the subject of the introductory course. Seven of these colleges require the student to begin his historical study with the Middle Ages, five with ancient history, three with ancient, mediæval, and modern history, and two with English history.

The personnel of the teaching staff in history in the colleges of our section, is on the whole, adequately trained and well qualified for its work. Hence the first problem for the college is not, as in the school, to secure well-trained and skilled teachers of history, but to establish the place of history in the curriculum, which, as I understand it, is the important and worthy subject of our present discussion.

I have gained the impression, although it is impossible fully to verify it, that in some of our colleges courses in history occupy places in the curricula which are determined not by careful consideration of where they ought to go, but by the practical limitations of the time schedule and teaching force, and by such influences as the prescriptive right of older-established subjects to positions in certain terms or years. So it is but fair to say that the status in a given college may not represent the views of the teachers of history of that faculty.

Before we can decide what courses shall be offered and where they shall be placed, we must determine what the purpose of history instruction in the college is; for the problem

differs materially if the object be to develop historical scholars and investigators, rather than to increase the culture of the average student. A very small proportion of college students become trained investigators in the historical field, and a decided minority only of the whole number pursue the more advanced historical courses of the college. The good of the greatest number should be sought in planning the work of the course. It seems to me too obvious to demand proof that the large general or prescribed courses in history (and I heartily agree with Professor Haskins that these constitute the problem of the college historical curriculum) should be handled primarily from the standpoint of culture, and conducted for the benefit of the majority, who do not purpose to follow the more advanced courses. One of the evils of our present system is the tendency of college instructors to regard the scholarship and ability in research of a few seniors as the end for which the department exists. It is a legitimate end, but, I submit, should not be the chief end of college historical instruction. In the general or introductory course, then, a twofold purpose must be kept in view: first and foremost the broadening and deepening of the culture of the average student; second, the laying of a foundation of historical information upon which to base a further and more specialized course of historical study, *i. e.*, it must be treated both as an end in itself and as a preparation for further study.

This twofold end of the general course introduces the question as to the position of the course in the curriculum. Regarded as a culture course alone, doubtless the junior year would be the most advantageous time, but as the disciplinary and preparatory nature of the course must be considered as well, the practice of the majority of the colleges of placing it in the freshman or sophomore year must be held the correct one.

If culture is to be the main end of our introductory course, it follows that the subject should be taught, not by the youngest tutor or instructor, but by the experienced professor of broad culture and ripe scholarship. The inexperienced instructor, fresh from an extended course of study in his specialty, would be relatively much more valuable in advanced courses, where smaller numbers of specially interested students pursue investigations in limited fields.

It is so important that the student should have the best possible instruction in this culture course that it may be advisable, in the small college, to have any one of several fields covered, according to the particular bent or ability of the professor. Practically, I would narrow the range of choice to the subjects: general history, with or without ancient history; mediæval history; and English history. I would exclude the history of the United States, because it has been more generally and perhaps better taught in the schools than the subjects named, and because European history, covering, as it does, a wider and, on the whole, a richer field, contains more of culture value. Moreover, European history is a necessary foundation for further historical study.

At least one general culture course in history should be prescribed for every college student, as an essential requirement for the bachelor's degree. We have gone too far in the American college in regarding work as valuable only as it prepares for something specific beyond: law, medicine, advanced or graduate work, or, indeed, anything that will directly assist in bread-winning. The idea of culture for its own sake should be restored in our colleges. Our subject—history—is pre-eminently fitted to advance this end by interpreting through the broadest and most scholarly men of the historical department the race experience of the past.

The discussion of Professor Haskins's paper was further continued by Prof. J. Montgomery Gambrill, of the Baltimore Polytechnic Institute.

In discussing the history curriculum of the college, it is necessary to consider the general aim of historical study and the amount of historical training prior to entrance. The purposes of historical study, which I need not attempt to enumerate now, can, I believe, be realized more fully by the college than by the lower schools. For example, training of the judgment and the critical sense is always named among the aims of historical study; a bare beginning in this may be made in elementary work; some very useful training may be given in the high school; but in the college results of real maturity may be secured by proper methods. The three curricula should form a kind of spiral.

I am convinced of the importance of requiring at least an outline knowledge of the whole course of general history prior to taking up the intensive work of the college. If it is impracticable to require this, then the college should offer entirely different courses for those who have pursued such a course as recommended by the Committee of Seven, and for those who have barely enough historical training to enter. The student who attempts the study of a special period or topic without some knowledge of the general course of history will find it impossible to understand fully its connections and its significance and thus fail to realize its full benefits. Moreover, many of the allusions and comparisons that must be met in reading will be meaningless to him. I am of the further opinion that in our just contempt for drill, "grind," dynastic annals, and "drum and trumpet" history, we are in danger of allowing the reaction to carry us too far. Upon a basis of "mere facts" the really important work in history must be built, and if the foundations are sandy, how can the superstructure be other than insecure?

It seems to me eminently proper to specialize in the college work, but it should be intensive as to subjects, as well as to periods of time. As an example, the subject of federal government, studied in its historical development from ancient times to the present, and possibly based upon the little work by John Fiske, called *American Political Ideas*, would be fully as fruitful in every way as the study of some important epoch in English or general history. An element of special timeliness and contemporaneous interest might be given to such topics. For instance, the present war in the East might be the occasion for studying the whole question of the struggle between Eastern and Western civilization, from Marathon to the present, with the interesting but difficult problem of just what each combatant in the present struggle represents.

The key to the solution of the problem, so far as there is a key, will be found when we have determined what the secondary school can and should do for its pupils before they begin the work of the college. The subject of a college curriculum in history is only a part of the larger problem of history courses in all the schools,—elementary, secondary, and collegiate,—and its possibilities must depend in great measure upon what are found to be the possibilities of the other two.

The discussion was closed by the Secretary, who rose to ask several questions:

It has been assumed in the discussion thus far that the teachers in the colleges are "well trained." Is this so? Do their students think that they are well trained? Are they trained to acquire knowledge or to impart it? Where classes are not interested in the work, is it because of "original sin"? Do classes ever fail to be interested when the content of the course is of prime historical importance? Should the course itself appeal to the members as having real value? In a word, are the methods of presentation and the content of the course sufficiently defined in the discussion thus far?

THE WORK OF THE CARNEGIE INSTITUTION

The work of the Carnegie Institution of Washington was described in a short talk by Prof. A. C. McLaughlin, who has been put in charge of the Bureau of Historical Research, which has been recently established. The Carnegie Institution was founded in January, 1902, by Mr. Carnegie, who gave a liberal sum for its maintenance. The purpose of the grant was not to establish an educational institution in the sense in which those words are commonly used, but to promote original investigation; "to discover the exceptional man in every department of study, whenever and wherever found, inside or outside of schools, and enable him to make the work for which he seems specially designed his life work," and by other methods to assist in the development of scholarly investigation. In carrying out the purpose of the foundation, the trustees have entered upon a series of important undertakings, and have made grants which are likely to be of great service in the extension of human knowledge. The grants made are of two kinds: (1), that for the purpose of enabling an investigator to conduct an important piece of research which, in the minds of the trustees, deserves special recognition; and (2), that made to a scholar, not because of the special task which he has on hand, but because he is supposed to be a person of exceptional merit and promise, and to deserve special encouragement and assistance.

The speaker referred only in passing to the more important undertakings entered upon by the Institution, but naturally confined his attention to the work of the Bureau of Historical

Research and the ends it has in view. The establishment of this bureau was, in part at least, due to the recommendation for the establishment of some sort of institute or school at Washington, not dissimilar in character to the French, Prussian, and Austrian Institutes at Rome. It was hoped that the bureau thus established might make examinations of the government archives, prepare for publication certain portions that seemed to merit special attention, and, in general, be of service to historical scholars outside of Washington who might need to make use of the historical materials of that city. In carrying out these designs, something has already been accomplished. A portion of the time of the director of the Bureau of Historical Research is taken up with the direction of the *American Historical Review*, of which he is the managing editor, the connection between the *Review* and the Institution being helpful to the work of each. Steps were taken in the early part of 1903 to prepare a guide to the Federal archives at Washington, a task which is as yet not fully completed. A volume may, however, be expected in the course of a few months. The guide will not attempt to be an index to the individual documents, for in many of the departments the records can be described only in very general terms, and by giving their weight in tons or the shelving occupied in miles. In the case, however, of the more important collections, the archives are somewhat carefully treated in such a way that definite information as to their contents will be conveyed. Practically every bureau of the Executive Departments, as well as the offices of the other branches of the government, has been visited and a personal inspection has been made of their contents. The result of the study ought to be that historical scholars will have much more accurate knowledge than heretofore of the extent and character of the archives of the National government. The volume will also give descriptions of the duties of the various bureaus of the government in such a way as to indicate the character of their records, and to exhibit the working of the government in ordinary course of administration.

The Bureau of Historical Research has also undertaken the preparation of an annual bibliography of current writings in American history and biography. The writings for 1902 have already been listed and published by Dr. E. C. Richardson of

Princeton. The volume for 1903 is now in course of preparation in Washington, and will be published at the earliest opportunity. Arrangements have also been made for the preparation and publication of a guide to the American material in the English archives, from the beginning to the end of the Revolution. This work is now largely in the hands of Prof. C. M. Andrews, who is in London engaged upon the task. Accompanying the description of the materials will appear a list of documents from the English archives that are now printed and thus accessible, and will also include a list describing the transcripts from the English archives that are now to be found in American libraries. It is hoped that this volume will be published early in 1904. Mr. McLaughlin is also making a somewhat careful examination of some of the archives of the State Department, chiefly those bearing upon strictly diplomatic affairs, in order that the bureau may have acquaintance with these sources, which are of continuing interest to American historical scholars. In conclusion, the speaker called attention to the fact that the bureau was established in order that it might be of use to historical investigators. The hope is entertained that by one method or another it may be of service in aiding scholars to discover and make use of the documentary material which exists in such vast quantity in Washington.

The Friday evening session was held in the large auditorium of the Central High School. Principal Thompson extended a genial and cordial welcome to the Association, after which President John Finley, of the City College, New York City, spoke at length upon certain discoveries of the long-lost writings of some of the Greek poets and the consequent gain to the world.

The program of the Saturday morning session, held in Houston Hall, was opened with the reading of the report of a committee upon College Entrance Requirements in History :

REPORT OF COMMITTEE UPON COLLEGE ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS IN HISTORY

MADAM PRESIDENT:

The instructions which constituted your committee directed its action upon the following questions:

First, Is it best for the colleges to require for admission one, two, three, or four of the following units: (A) ancient history, (B) mediæval history, (C) English history, (D) American history?

Second, If the colleges agree that they can require but one unit, is it best to give the secondary schools the option of presenting any one of these or only a specified one, as, for instance, (A)?

After careful consideration we are agreed that it is impossible to render satisfactory answers to these questions without entering into the entire question of the relation of the work of the secondary schools to the colleges. A brief statement of some of the present conditions will make this manifest.

Your committee unanimously support the recommendations of both the Committee of Ten and the Committee of Seven, that the course of study in history in the secondary schools should be constructed to subserve the ends for which the secondary schools exist. No pressure from the relatively few students who expect to enter college should interfere with this; no conditions imposed by the colleges should be permitted to disarrange or shorten the course in history of the greatest advantage to the future citizen, who must secure from the secondary school *alone* whatever of historic knowledge or feeling he may possess. The knowledge of institutions and ideas, both in their present form and in their historic development; the relation of our own to other peoples, far and near; the acquaintance with books and men; the rare opportunities history affords of thinking about the facts and principles which underlie daily practices,—these are all too valuable to be denied to the many for the sake of preparing the few to meet college entrance requirements.

Yet, as it appears to your committee, the present conditions imposed on the secondary schools by the colleges materially modify the amount of history taught, the method of presenta-

tion, the arrangement of subjects, and the general value of the study. A few statements of fact will make this evident.

Most secondary schools under public control prepare a larger or smaller proportion of their pupils for college. The pressure on school authorities from these pupils for courses and methods which best prepare them to pass the entrance examinations is direct, continuous, and insistent—it might almost be termed "perniciously active." No similar pressure is felt from the students who do not intend to go to college, and therefore the interests of the majority are sacrificed to the requirements of the comparatively small number who are planning to pursue an advanced course of study.

Three courses of action lie open to the schools: (1) to form separate sections for students expecting to enter college; (2) to disregard their wants entirely; or (3) to modify the course so as to meet the college requirements. The first course is impossible in most schools, because of the comparatively small number entering college, and the varying conditions imposed by the different institutions for which any one school must prepare; the second is manifestly impossible in any community where an energetic student or his parents possess what is termed "influence"; the third course is the one usually adopted, viz., to modify the history curriculum to meet the demands of the insistent few.

In the so-called "preparatory schools," whether public or private, the course must evidently be adapted to the college requirements. This means little history, and that badly taught. History for its own sake is impossible. A master in a Boston school, teaching in a section preparing for Harvard, asked a half dozen times in a single recitation, "Why is this important?" and each time received and *accepted* the answer, "Because it appears in the Harvard examination papers." The value of history to such students may be easily imagined. This may have been an unusual instance, but it well illustrates the influence of the college on present methods in the preparatory schools.

To determine the prevailing standard of history requirements in this country, your committee has examined the catalogues of twenty-nine representative colleges, and has found that twenty of these demand two courses in history, three demand three courses, and six demand one course. It is safe to say that

a majority of our colleges require two courses in history for entrance. Almost all of them accept ancient and American history; many designate these as required. Most of the colleges accept these only when studied within two years of the date when the examination is taken. Some permit the examination to be taken in different years; others do not.

From a casual glance at the requirements of almost any of these colleges it would seem that every opportunity had been afforded the preparatory school for meeting these demands without disturbing in the least its own history courses. The practical working of the scheme is exactly the reverse. The two-year limit for examinations, by which is meant that a subject must have been studied in class within two years of the examination date, means that ancient history must be taken up in one of the last two years of the preparatory course, or, if studied in the first year, as suggested by the Committee of Seven, that it must be reviewed in the last year. Therefore the preparatory school must either disarrange the ordinary four-year course of study or duplicate its work by reviewing the subject in the last years, and thus lose time which the student can ill afford. Again, the credit given in entrance to history seems liberal, but this is true only in appearance. The work necessary to make a required number of points in a single subject, such as a language, is found by experience to be less than that necessary to earn the same number of points in a group of unrelated subjects. Consequently the time spent on history in a preparatory school is out of proportion to that spent in gaining the same number of credits in the language studies, and as a result history suffers.

This last statement points attention at once to the fact that the *entrance examinations still centre about the languages.* History is in no worse plight than physics, chemistry, biology, etc., except that it is more universally required for entrance, and therefore feels the stress more. With all these the difficulty is fundamentally the same. When it is recognized by college faculties that there is mental discipline and training in other studies equal to that in mathematics and the languages, although of a somewhat different character, and that the realm of knowledge open to the secondary student is so wide that perforce he is constrained to leave some of it untouched, then we may hope

for entrance regulations which will not force both students and principals to elect the languages as the easiest way of entering colleges, nor deprive these other studies of the right to stand on an equal footing, *in fact as well as in theory*.

The worst effect of entrance requirements on the preparatory school, however, is the "cram method" of teaching which is widely prevalent. It may not be necessary; the teachers think it so. It is not always in evidence in such striking form as in the case noted above, but it is still there in some measure. Said one teacher recently (and he not a man who could be accused of being a devotee of a study of methods), "I love to teach history; I hate to cram pupils."

From these considerations it is evident that the entrance requirements in history affect vitally the work both of students who go to college and those who do not. It is also plain that any solution of the question must be sought through a discussion of the entire history course in both secondary school and college. This is the province of another committee.

Since the question of entrance examinations is a matter of practice as well as of theory, it is plain that the men and women who do the work in the secondary schools should be represented in the committee charged with its consideration. The committee making this report is composed entirely of college men. Having stated the conditions as they appear from the point of view of the college, your committee therefore suggests and begs leave formally to recommend that the two committees of the Association be combined, and that the committee thus formed be directed to consider the subject of entrance examinations in connection with the general topic of the articulation of the courses in history in colleges and secondary schools.

This suggestion is reinforced by conditions in the colleges which are a direct outcome of the system of entrance examinations, and which affect the work of the college professor as vitally as the above-mentioned conditions do the secondary teacher. Both are facing the same problem in different aspects. A brief statement will make this clear.

The college can, as a general rule, make little direct use of the knowledge of historical fact that a student brings from his preparatory school. Only a part of the freshmen have studied any specific subject, *e. g.*, English history, at all, and the

knowledge of those who have done so varies greatly. The composite of such a class is a Joseph's coat of historic knowledge, and is apt to be quite as irritating to the college professor as was the original garment to Joseph's brethren. If, then, the college instructor admits all to the same class, as is commonly necessary, he is forced to accommodate his instruction to the needs of the most ignorant. The better informed are sure to resent this, for they regard it with some justice as a repetition in college of the work already done in the secondary school. Interest is dulled. The students feel that they have "passed that up long ago."

In attempting to make use of such knowledge of the technique of historical study as his students may have acquired in the preparatory schools, the college teacher is confronted by a like heterogeneity of preparation. Here the case is even worse than in respect of mere information, for in some instances he finds that there have been used in the secondary schools methods of historical study which are positively vicious.

Again, in many cases students report "no taste for history," or even a frank aversion to it, as a result of their secondary school experience. Opinions may vary as to its cause. To many college teachers of history it seems highly probable that more interest would be taken in the study of history in the college, and better work would be done, if the keen edge of the student's interest had not been blunted by the deadening attempt to fit him for entrance examinations.

With the recommendation that a combined committee be formed and instructed, as suggested above, your committee concludes and submits its report proper.

Your committee, however, in its deliberations was so much impressed with a suggestion of one of its members, made with a view to recasting the forms of the four period-units as the basis of instruction in history in the secondary schools, that it feels in duty bound to present to the Association this proposal in the form presented to the committee by the member offering it, and, without any attempt to prejudice the matter, to express the hope that it will be made a subject of careful consideration by the Association. As the subject is one of grave importance, your committee would suggest that the author of the proposal be asked to present it to the Association at this meeting, in

greater detail than in the form about to be offered, and ventures to express the desire that the matter may thereafter be referred to the combined committee recommended in the foregoing report, if such committee shall be appointed.

Your committee is quite conscious of the important service rendered by the Committee of Seven in promoting historical studies in the schools. The distinguished scholars who constituted that committee suggested a working division of the various historical fields, recommended the order of treatment, and assigned the time to be devoted to each subject. Through their labors and those of the earlier Committee of Ten, which met at Madison in 1892, history was first raised to the rank of a study of recognized standing in the schools, and bids fair to receive more generous treatment as time goes on.

It is natural, however, that as history is more extensively and carefully taught, difficulties should become apparent, even in the most skillfully devised system, and that new methods of meeting them should occur to those engaged in the teaching and study of the subject. When your committee approached the question of college entrance requirements, based upon the course of study recommended by the Committee of Seven, a doubt speedily arose as to the expediency and finality of the accepted division of historical work into Ancient, Mediæval and Modern, English, and American. These misgivings in regard to the foundation upon which recommendations were to rest led to the conclusion that it would be inexpedient to consider college entrance requirements until the more fundamental question of the studies in the secondary schools had been considered. While your committee was not empowered to report upon that more general and intricate matter, it asks the privilege of stating very briefly certain of the possibilities of betterment in the school curriculum:

(1) The division Ancient History is itself an historical growth whose nucleus is, of course, the older "classical" or Greek and Roman history of our own childhood. In order to do justice to the recent progress in Assyriology and Egyptology, those teaching ancient history were forced to give up the siege of Troy as their *terminus a quo*, and recede as easily as might be, three millenniums or so, and gather up the faint vestiges of civilization scattered along the banks of the Nile and of the Eu-

phrates. Not satisfied, however, with this generous introduction to the older "classical" history, the Committee of Seven went further, and urged the teacher no longer to close the period as of old with the accession of Augustus, but to carry the history of Europe down to the time of Charlemagne, thus adding eight centuries of confused events to the preceding review of 4000 years. Your committee does not question the expediency of this division of Ancient History, but believes that the vast extent of the field which it must cover implies a radical reduction of the original nucleus of classical history. For example, the constitutional history of Athens, the Peloponnesian War, a great part of the early struggles of the Romans and of their later civil broils must be sacrificed in view of the wealth of material of first-rate importance which is now included in the course.

(2) The division Mediæval and Modern History, although a perfectly natural one, has one conspicuous vice: As it has hitherto been treated, the pupil comes away with no clearer notion of his own times than of those of Attila or of Frederick Barbarossa. This is certainly a great pity. Would not this division gain greatly in clearness if the history of the past century and a half were omitted, so that the course would end with the Treaty of Utrecht and the demise of Louis XIV.? These events closed, in a way, the old *régime* in Europe. From the middle of the eighteenth century on, the problems loom large which still face us, and these should be allotted a more generous period in our programmes of study. Leaving this matter for a moment, let us turn to:

(3) The divisions, English and American History, to which the Committee of Seven feels that a year each should be assigned. It occurs to your committee that it might be possible advantageously to merge these subjects into a general account of the English people from the time of their settlement on English soil in the fifth century to their occupation or control of a great part of the earth where we find them to-day. This course would have two obvious advantages: it would avoid the repetition of American history in the high schools in a form similar to that in which it is universally taught in grammar schools. Moreover, a year would be saved by this amalgamation which could be utilized for a new course, which would form a fitting culmination for the secondary-school work and a happy preparation for those pupils who purpose to enter college.

(4) The fourth division, as it lies in the minds of your committee, would be a history of the world from a European standpoint since the middle of the eighteenth century, and would be designed first and foremost to explain the great problems of the present. In order to put the pupil *au courant* of the world in which he lives, it is unnecessary to go back of the middle of the eighteenth century, let us say, the Seven Years' War. From there the development of modern Europe and of its relations to the world at large can be clearly traced. The question of the control of England and America was then still unsettled, Russia and Prussia were but beginning to play their rôle, the Turkish Empire was as yet undissolved, Germany and Italy still unconsolidated. Europe still had before it the French Revolution, the development of democracy, the progress of invention, the industrial revolution, modern commerce, and world politics. It is clear that this course should embrace not only political affairs, but the elements of economic history, of commercial geography, and the progress of applied science. In this way it would form a substantial basis for further study in any of these various fields.

In schools where it is judged inexpedient to devote more than two years to the study of history, this course upon the recent history of the world could very properly follow a reformed course upon ancient history. In the opinion of your committee these two courses would form a better basis for work in college than those represented in the scheme recommended by the Committee of Seven. Having, however, raised the more general question of a revision of the system pursued in the secondary schools, the committee think it best to defer for the present a discussion of the specific relation between the proposed courses and the college work, since after all the fundamental problem is to adjust the work regardless of the demands of the college in such a way that it will best subserve the interests of the pupils in the secondary schools.

Your committee makes one formal recommendation and an informal suggestion:

1. The recommendation: The appointment of a combined committee within the purview of whose consideration shall come "Questions Concerning College Entrance Requirements in

History" and the subject-matter of "Articulation of Work in History in Colleges and Secondary Schools";

2. The suggestion: That to the committee thus constituted there be also referred the suggestion of a revision of the history course in the secondary schools, with a view to the possible substitution of a basis as to times and subjects of the history units different to that recommended by former committees.

AUSTIN SCOTT, *Chairman*, W. C. MOREY,
E. P. CHEYNEY, C. H. HULL,
J. H. ROBINSON, E. H. CASTLE.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE ON THE ARTICULATION OF WORK IN HISTORY IN COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The report of the above committee, read by its chairman, Dr. James Sullivan, of the New York High School of Commerce, is too long to be published here in full. The following is a brief summary of the main points, accompanied by the specific recommendations with which the committee closed its report.

The first step towards articulation of the work in the schools and colleges should be the formulation and introduction of a somewhat uniform system. This has been done for the secondary schools by the Committee of Seven; no such even tentative plan has ever been recommended as yet for the colleges. Until this is done your committee is precluded from considering the question of the articulation of *courses*. They may, however, venture to make some suggestions in regard to the articulation of the *methods* of teaching employed in the schools with those in the colleges. Indeed, to some it seems more important to determine *how* to study than *what* to study.

Here, however, the committee has little to work upon, and can only review the badly co-ordinated system already in existence. The methods now employed in schools are: recitation, discussion, the lecture, or a combination of any two or three of these. Used in conjunction with these at times is a method which we may term "auxiliary." Its aim is to teach students to look up topics in other works than the text-book. While the old system of recitation tends to keep the student regularly at

work, it is likely to deprive the subject of life and interest. The use of the lecture, pure and simple, in secondary schools is very uncommon. It is possible, however, that it might be introduced into the last year so as to articulate the work with the methods used in many colleges.

The so-called auxiliary method must, of course, be used in connection with lectures, and may be combined with recitations. Its natural result is a useful development of discussion, but it cannot be adopted unless a good library is available and the teacher is in a position to give an almost unlimited amount of time outside of the classroom to the arranging of references. Its value is, however, very great. It develops the student's power of initiative, and when called upon in later life to do a piece of work for himself in his professional or business career, the student is not helpless, as the uneducated man would be. The objection to the method is that it requires a greater amount of time than the student can ordinarily afford to give in view of his other subjects.

In the colleges the lecture is a very common method of presentation. In some cases there is a good deal of use made of "source reading" and sometimes of lantern slides. Some teachers require much collateral reading and outline work, and others rely upon the lecture, or still more upon the text-book. In some of our larger institutions, like Harvard and Michigan, lectures are given to a class of several hundred members, but the students then meet in several divisions, when an assistant questions them with a view to determining the extent of their progress. Recitation, in the sense in which the word is used in the secondary schools, is rarely employed in the college, as it suits neither the instructor nor the students. There is, however, a growing distrust of the lecture system.

There is a tendency on the part of the college instructor to condemn all suggestions in regard to method. If all teachers were endowed with the fire of genius, methods certainly need hardly be discussed, but, as a college president has well said, method "is a means of supplying persons of unoriginal minds and of very slight force of personality with a means of livelihood. Every school (and college) wants teachers whose method is themselves; whose success dwells in something that nobody ever described or analyzed; which proceeds from the interior,

spiritual force of the individual. But we cannot get a whole faculty of persons of that sort. The Lord has been a little niggardly, let us say, in making persons of that kind, and therefore we must discuss questions of method." In order to accomplish the improvement which we all desire in the courses and methods in both secondary schools and colleges, and produce a useful articulation which may facilitate the work of the student in passing from the school to the college, your committee makes the following recommendations:

1. A book commonly used as a text-book in secondary schools should not be used as a text in colleges.

2. Elementary work in the colleges should show a proper advance over the advanced work in the schools both as to texts used and as to time required in and out of the classroom.

3. A proper sequence should be shown in the arrangement of the college courses.

4. There should be a conscious differentiation in aim of work in secondary school, college, and university.

5. The work of teaching history in the secondary school or college should not be given over to men who are specialists in other departments, and who have little interest in its teachings.

6. Methods which encourage cramming in either secondary school or college should be abandoned.

7. Secondary school and college teachers should attempt to adapt their methods and their work to the students under their instruction.

8. Courses on methods of instruction in history for colleges should be established for the benefit of those who expect to teach in colleges.

9. Students in history courses in colleges may reasonably be expected to buy more books than they are at present called upon to do.

The committee consisted of:

James Sullivan, *Chairman*,
J. L. Tildsley,
J. L. Allen,
H. A. Sill,
J. B. Carter.

The discussion of the two reports was opened by Prof. W. I. Hull, of Swarthmore College.

In order to discuss with any degree of satisfaction to myself or other people the two very excellent committee reports to which we have just listened, it would be necessary for me to read, re-read, and ponder over them. They fairly bristle with suggestive points. I will undertake, however, to emphasize one of these points which appears to me to be one of the most important. I refer to the recommendation which appears in both reports, that the course in ancient history should be concluded with the year 375 or 476 A.D., instead of with 814, as suggested by the Committee of Seven.

I am in very hearty accord with this recommendation, and for various reasons. In the first place, I have talked with a number of teachers in our secondary schools who have endeavored faithfully to carry their classes through the entire period of Greek, Roman, and early mediæval history down to 814, and I have yet to find a single teacher who admits that the work has been done successfully, their universal testimony being that it is impossible to cover the entire field in a satisfactory manner in the time at their disposal. The study of the four centuries of early mediæval history, coming as it does after the study of the very rich field of Greek and Roman history, is found to be in the nature of an anti-climax, and seems to contribute the final straw which breaks the camel's back.

But I must frankly say that I should be very glad to see one step farther taken in the same direction, and to have in our secondary schools an entire year devoted to Greek history, and an entire year to Roman history, down to the years 375 or 476 A.D. My own experience in teaching ancient history to freshman classes in college has convinced me of the undesirability of endeavoring to cover both the fields of Greek and Roman history in a single year. I have tried it year after year, and invariably, no matter what new devices I may have adopted for the economy of time, at the end of every year I have rested under a sense of moral condemnation for having made the attempt, feeling that I had more or less wasted my own time and that of my students.

The plan which I suggest would enable a better co-ordination of studies in the secondary schools to be made. It would permit the use of sources to become more than merely illustra-

tive as they are at present. It would provide for a better articulation of history work between the secondary schools and the college. It would provide sufficient time for the application of the comparative method, that method which has been so fruitful in the scientific study of our century. And, above all, it would enable the student to do thorough instead of superficial work; it would enable him really to enter into the spirit of the times and of the people studied, and it would impress upon him the dignity of real historical study. The swan-like method of swimming over such large surfaces in entire ignorance of the depths which lie below is calculated to increase superficial judgment in the students of history, and to persuade them to a belief that history is a science which can be mastered by the rapid reading of a few text-books. I believe that the time has come when from the very commencement of historical studies the student should be impressed with the fact that the science of history can no more be mastered without thorough laboratory work than can the science of chemistry or physics.

I would also extend the work in history in our secondary schools in such a way that one year, in addition to the two devoted to Greek and Roman history, should be devoted to mediæval European history down to 1648 or 1713, another year to the modern European history, a fifth year to the history of England, and a sixth year to the history of the United States. Of course, with such a plan, some of these courses would necessarily be parallel courses, and it would be impossible for any student to take all of the history which is offered; but there is no more necessity for a secondary-school pupil to take all of the courses of history offered in his school than for a college or university student to take all of the courses in history which are offered in the college or university curriculum.

It has been found desirable within recent years, in consequence of the archæological discoveries which have been made, to commence a study of ancient history with at least a brief review of the history of the ancient orient; and events are at this moment transpiring which may make it desirable some ten or fewer years from now, that the study of the modern orient should be more than a mere perfunctory glance at the orient as a field of European exploitation. Clio stands with uplifted hand, never writing the last word, but waiting, waiting; and

the field of history is necessarily broadened with the "process of the suns." Hence it will become increasingly difficult for a secondary-school pupil to take a survey of the entire field. All the great lessons of history can be taught, and better taught, by an intensive cultivation of a homogeneous period rather than by an extensive survey, especially on the part of an immature student, of the entire field.

For these and other reasons, which I have not time to go into at present, I very cordially welcome the recommendation of our committees that the field of ancient history should be restricted at least to the period ending with 375 or 476; and I sincerely hope that this Association will adopt the further suggestion which I have made in the direction of a more intensive study of history, both in the institutions of secondary and higher education.

The last suggestion may seem to be impracticable at the present time, because of lack of adequate appropriations for history teaching in our secondary schools; but there are signs that these appropriations will become more nearly adequate in the near future. At all events it may be permitted me to apply in this connection the words which Gouverneur Morris placed in the mouth of George Washington, presiding over an important convention held in this city: "Let us set up a standard to which the wise and the honest may repair"; and I firmly believe that the event is very largely in the hands of this Association.

The discussion was further continued by Miss Emma G. Sebring, Principal of St. Agatha School, New York City:

It is to be hoped that discussion and agitation are good for the soul. If such they be, the educational soul must be in a healthy state, even if misguided in many of its practices, as we have been led to think.

A chief subject of agitation of late has been the curtailing of the college course, that the average age of graduation may be lowered. This seems to be largely, if not entirely, in the interest of intending professors of medicine, of law, and of the other learned professions which are so rapidly increasing in learnedness that very nearly half a lifetime must be spent in preparation.

Now, such curtailment as is contemplated and urged may be accomplished in various ways, but notably in two: either by

a process of elimination of requirements for graduation from college, or by an extension of requirements for admission thereto. College authorities seem for the most part averse to the former plan; tacitly, if not openly, they favor the latter, if they are to be judged by their deeds. But they seem to forget that an increase of entrance requirements means a lengthening of the period of preparation, and consequently an advance in the age of admission to college. So, as far as age is concerned, what is subtracted from one end of the course is added to the other, and the result remains the same.

But the adjustment is not so simple as may appear. Agitation has spread from the college world to the schools, and we have forced upon our consideration the advisability of a five, and even a six-year high school course. The word "advisability" is a euphemism. "Necessity" is more to the point, for the pressure upon the preparatory school is twofold.

Since universities have become so conspicuously an American institution, and since university work has become so much the fashion in this country, the colleges have waxed overambitious to the extent of mistaking their calling. They are adopting university ideals and methods, and in pursuance of this plan, whether consciously or unconsciously, are perforce requiring of the secondary schools college work. So with the continual increase of demands on the part of the college from one cause or another, the secondary schools of the country are sorely taxed and are proposing as expedients of relief a lengthening of their course on the one hand, and on the other a pushing of their work down into the elementary school at a sacrifice of subjects which more properly belong to the grammar grades. Thus from the primary we seem to be preparing for college.

In view of these facts, it is hoped that the influence of this association may be exerted to modify, and not increase, the strained conditions of the secondary schools, at least as far as the subject of history is concerned. In this respect the following points are submitted:

1. A four-years' course in history should be required of secondary-school pupils who are not going to college.

2. Two years' work in history is a maximum amount that can be required of high-school students who are preparing for college, as long as the other college entrance requirements re-

main the same. It is not the purpose to discuss here the relative values of entrance requirements, though the opinion may be ventured that it is difficult to see what other subject can be more important than history. The contention is simply this that while other requirements remain the same, not more than two years' work in history can be asked of students preparing for college.

3. Ancient history is recommended as the most appropriate subject for college entrance requirement for several reasons.

(1) Criticism to the contrary, Greek and Roman history is, or should be, closely related to the study of the classics, which need to be made definite and to be illuminated by historical study.

(2) Much of the English literature prescribed for college entrance contains a large classical element, needing a fuller interpretation than reference to encyclopedias and handbooks can give.

(3) A proper historical perspective points to the chronological order of subjects as the most appropriate, while a fair comprehension of modern civilization is hardly possible without an acquaintance with the history of those two great peoples of ancient time, whose legacy to succeeding generations forms so integral and basic a part of our present civilization.

(4) Ancient history, particularly the history of Greece and Rome, is rich in content and yet comparatively simple in outline, and therefore appropriate in point of interest and comprehension to high-school students.

It is recommended that this course in ancient history in the high school be followed in the freshman year in college by such a course in mediæval history as Professor Haskins yesterday outlined. It is difficult to see why this work in the high school cannot be made the basis of subsequent work in college, and thus an articulation between high-school and college work in history be secured.

4. It is contended that ancient history, if it is to include the history of Egypt and the Orient as well as of Greece and of Rome, is too full a course to be crowded into one year's work, if anything but a most cursory and summary view of the period is to be given. If definiteness of knowledge based upon a fair attention to detail, clear ideas of relation and sequence, and a

sound historical method of study are to be gained, then a hasty and general treatment of this extended period will defeat the end. Further, this course, to be made broad and vital, should be accompanied by correlative courses in the history of the art of the different peoples whose civilization is studied. For any such work as this one year will poorly suffice.

In continuing the discussion, Prof. C. J. Geer, Shady Side Academy, Pittsburg, said:

Happily, arguments need not be adduced why history should have, in a program of studies, a place co-ordinate with language, mathematics, and science. This is conceded. The historical field has been given boundaries tolerably well defined as to the number of subjects, the order in which they should be attempted, and the time allotted to each. Substantial agreement has also been reached in regard to the best methods of instruction. These are the common grounds.

The most serious unsettled problem is the recommendation of President Scott's committee, that there should be one high-school course for students who expect to enter college and another for those who do not. On this point there is not general concurrence among committees and educators. Most high-school teachers, recognizing the congested state of existing programs of study, and feeling keenly the pressure from the colleges in the increase of entrance requirements, admit the necessity of discrimination. Professor Bourne writes: "In theory, there should be no difference between what will best prepare a pupil for college and what may widely be done in a secondary school. It is true, also, that the agitation for a more intelligent use of history in the schools has received its inspiration from the college; but the college officers, in arranging entrance requirements, usually have in mind what is to be accomplished by the candidate for admission, and they do not sufficiently consider the bearings of problems of secondary education on the question." His inquiry, "Should not the secondary-school pupils be divided into two classes, and those who enter college be given a course primarily arranged to prepare for their college work?" indicates his position in favor of discrimination.

The Madison Conference, however, emphatically declares: "The instruction in history and related subjects ought to be

precisely the same for pupils on the way to college or the science school as for those who expect to stop at the end of the grammar school or at the end of high school."

If I understand President Thwing's words correctly, he opposes the same discrimination: "The high school is a place for fitting for college and for life. The contrast between these two functions of the high school is often urged, and is often regarded as embodying contradictory purposes. But no contrast should be made. The process which fits for life should be a process also which fits for college; and the process which fits for college should be a process which fits for life as well."

At a North Carolina conference the following was expressed in course of discussion: "I believe it is generally admitted that the regular high-school course and the college preparatory course ought not to differ materially; that the same course which lays the best foundation for future study ought to lay the best foundation for future life; that no broad and exhaustive study is needed in the one more than in the other; and the real aim of each is towards the acquisition of power rather than of knowledge solely."

I dissent from these opinions touching history. I believe with the committee that there should be one course for pupils who enter college and another for those who do not; that the latter should comprehend the fields from ancient history to American, should extend throughout the four years and be co-ordinate with the subject accorded the most hours per week; but in intensity of study there should be no difference between the college and the non-college preparation.

Discrimination between the two classes is demanded by the consideration of time. It is impossible to meet the entrance requirements, and at the same time teach the maximum amount of history in high school. There is not time enough for it. Teachers are unanimous in saying that the requirements for college are exceeding the hours at their disposal. As Professor Coy pointedly asserted: "I wish those who would give three or four hours to history in the high school would sit down and make out a course of study and put it in. The Committee of Ten tried the experiment, and the result was that when they came to make out the program on the basis of their recommendations, they had more hours' work than there are hours in the week."

Actual conditions, unless they are ideal themselves, must modify an ideal course. Until the conditions in the high school are improved and the articulation of secondary and college programs is made closer, we must yield to the conditions and put into operation a working substitute.

Again, an equal degree of preparation can be secured by means of foreign languages. Since the colleges desire, not knowledge, but mental power, the same degree of training can be obtained by linguistic as by historical studies. The purpose of the secondary school—and this should be as fully accomplished in the boy who looks forward to college as in the one who does not—is to give him mastery of himself, an impulse towards higher development and greater service. The same means employed with differing individuals may not give the looked-for results. In prescribing courses we may be proscribing the very measure of power we seek.

Furthermore, the history which time prohibits in the secondary school can be pursued in college with more adequate facilities, and with mental powers better fitted for the work.

As to the other phase. Why should the college preparatory course include so many fields of history and extend throughout the secondary school? I quote a sufficient answer. "A youth who closes his schooling at seventeen or eighteen is most unlikely to undertake thereafter a line of study which is entirely new, or to carry on any study of foreign language or literature; but he is quite likely to pursue subjects in which he has already become interested and which may be carried on by the use of English. So that English branches are much more directly promotive of later study than is foreign language. To these general arguments, which would weigh equally whatever substitute might be proposed in place of foreign languages, we may add one in favor of history. In a country whose fate depends upon general political intelligence and high moral standards, there is no subject which ought to be more thoroughly understood than the history of other nations,—the contributions which they have made to the problems which we are to-day trying to solve; there is no inspiration which should be more eagerly courted than that of the noble men and women who have known how to die and how to live for God and humanity. Though many of the questions which would arise in such a course would be beyond the

powers of boys and girls, they present material for later thought; while the information acquired, and the patriotic enthusiasm aroused, would be the surest guarantee the schools could offer for a new generation of thoughtful, intelligent, devoted citizens. The more earnest the attention and the more profound the respect paid to this noble subject, the better the prospect of a country which we can not only love but honor."

President Scott's committee recommends that the more extended course in history culminate in "Modern history taught to put students in touch with present world movements." In this recommendation the committee exceeds the requirements suggested by the Committee of Seven. It is equivalent to an addition of a fifth field, since ancient, mediæval and modern, English and American history are still prescribed. The time allotment, however, is three instead of four years. This shortening of the time without lessening the volume of work, I do not favor. A danger lurks here. Rapid and superficial study will likely result in the effort to reach the general survey of the last year. This survey can be made, so far as the capacity of the pupil permits, in connection with English and American history, in the third and the fourth year respectively, and the same result will be attained without the risk of hasty preparation. Besides, such a course presupposes more comprehensive historical knowledge and greater powers of generalization than most high-school pupils, even in the fourth year, possess. This is a college phase of history, and should be deferred till then.

A year each to English and American history is more nearly an adequate allotment. I should place American history in the fourth year and supplement it with civil government. My own experience leads me to this opinion. In the school I represent, little less than three hours per week for a year is insufficient for a satisfactory study of American history; while English history but twice a week suffers even more. A half-year for each would tend toward a cramping process.

There is another reason. Every student who is not going to college and who, in consequence, cannot enjoy under favorable conditions a systematic study of his own land, should be permitted and, if necessary, urged to do so in the high school; for, to quote Professor Laurie, "The youth of our land must grow up in a knowledge of our own record of arts and arms,

just as they grow up in our own tongue and our own literature." This is a duty they owe to themselves and to their citizenship. Love of country is quickened by knowledge of country. If we do not love our own households, our own country, how can we love humanity? The vague and watery cosmopolitanism which some affect can be genuine only in so far as it rests on patriotic national feeling. History teaching fails to attain the highest moral and civic ends if it does not connect the boy with his own antecedents and all that has made him and the present possible. Therefore, I favor American history as the culminating course, because the secondary school, for the boy who can go no farther, must teach citizenship.

Prof. Charles H. Haskins, a member of the Committee of Seven, was called on by the President, and said:

If I may venture to speak as a member of the Committee of Seven, I think nothing has surprised the members of that committee so much as the disposition of some people to take its report more seriously than it was meant, and to treat its proposals as something sacred and unalterable. The committee had no expectation that its report would be considered as in any way final; it sought simply to make such recommendations as then seemed best adapted to the existing conditions of historical teaching in secondary schools. If the improvement in schools has been so rapid that these recommendations have already been outgrown at some points, no one can feel more satisfaction than the members of the committee. It is rather curious to find our report now considered too conservative. It is a very short time since many laughed at a four-year course in history as wholly impracticable; your committee now proposes a five-year course. We found most schools attempting to cover universal history in one year, and insisted that this could not be done in less than two years; your committee now says that two years are not time enough, and that a third year must be added for the study of the more recent period.

As regards the report of your committee, I do not care to enter upon a discussion of its recommendations without further opportunity to consider them. One or two points may, however, be mentioned. It has been said that ancient history is too difficult a subject for the first year in the high school. It may

not be easy to teach ancient history then, but is there any other field of history which is simpler or better adapted to this stage of instruction? The committee has proposed that the course in history for students who are going to college ought to be different from that for other students. That opens up a large question, but I venture to predict that in the long run the course of study in American schools, in history as in other subjects, will be the same for students preparing for college as for others.

Prof. J. H. Robinson then explained in greater detail the suggestion concerning the history curriculum in the high school which was presented in the report read by President Scott.

Dr. Julius Sachs said:

The remarks of the last speaker prompt me to a few words in support of the committee's report on the secondary history course. To one teacher at least in this assembly that portion of the report seemed particularly impressive which presented a readjustment of a four-years' course on a sounder principle of distribution of subject-matter than has hitherto obtained. Professor Robinson's scheme seems to me eminently worthy of deep thought on our part. Are we, then, to be kept away from the serious trial of such a scheme because of the familiar plaint that we have no time for it? If it is good, we *must* find time for it. I regard it as a slur upon American children that they are declared incapable of doing anything like the mental work of their equals in age on the other side of the Atlantic. This constant assertion that eighteen or twenty hours of weekly recitation is the limit beyond which no one must dare carry school work, is a barrier to all progress; our pupils *can* do more, if we recede from the absurd position of throwing the whole burden of preparation upon them; let teachers do their proper share of teaching, and illuminate the paths for their pupils, and they will find their pupils capable of a greater number of recitations; a logical history course involves *teaching* of history in the classroom, as opposed to mere recitation.

Dr. Eugene Lyttle said:

I agree with nearly everything the last speaker [Dr. Sachs] has said, and yet there is a very serious "if" in his proposition that students can accomplish twenty units of preparatory work

in four years. With such teaching as the speaker has in mind, it might be done; but I wish to speak for some six hundred high schools in New York State, where the teaching force and school conditions are not such that students can safely attempt to do more than sixteen units in four years. I have talked this subject over with perhaps one hundred principals in our state, and we are generally agreed that sixteen units of severe preparatory work is all that should be expected.

Now let us consider for the present only the students preparing for college. According to average entrance requirements at least seven units of foreign languages must be offered, three units of English, two units of mathematics,—making twelve units in all. This leaves a maximum of four units to be divided between history and science.

The Secretary said:

Permit me to call attention to a fact that has thus far escaped notice in the discussion. The year of intensive work found in the programs of the Committee of Ten and the Committee of Seven has disappeared from the proposed course. The practical effect of the intensive work in the former reports was to give good content in one year, but not to affect the content in the other years to any considerable extent. The proposed course substitutes for a single year of intensive work, *intensive work throughout the entire four years of the course.* This is one of the most fundamental things in it. This is to be secured by a study of fewer topics each year, but those of real historical value. It means fewer topics, but greater content in each. This smaller number of topics should, however, cover the great essentials.

BUSINESS MEETING

The Treasurer reported that he had received in dues $169.00, and had expended $167.27, leaving a balance on March 10 of $1.73. The expenses of the meeting and publishing the minutes were estimated at $100.00. There remained $103.00 in dues not paid. The estimated balance, after paying all expenses, would be $4.73. Since the expenses of organizing the Association and holding two meetings had been met with $269, it would be an easy task to carry on the work of the Association in the future and do the printing which should be done. The membership was 201.

The Auditing Committee, Professors W. I. Hull and H. V. Ames, reported that they had examined the report of the Treasurer and found it correct. This report was adopted.

The Committee on Nominations, Prof. E. P. Cheyney and Dr. J. T. Shotwell, reported the following nominations for officers for the ensuing year: President, Superintendent J. H. Van Sickle, Baltimore; Vice-President, Prof. M. S. Brown, New York University; Secretary and Treasurer, Prof. E. H. Castle, Teachers College; Council—Prof. Lucy M. Salmon, Vassar College; Prof. C. H. Hull, Cornell University; Prof. C. A. Herrick, Central High School, Philadelphia; Prof. P. O. Robinson, High School of Commerce, New York City; Prof. C. J. Geer, Shady Side Academy, Pittsburg. The report of the committee was adopted.

Upon motion the two committees of Dr. Sullivan and President Scott were combined, and to the combined committee were referred the recommendations and suggestions which accompanied the reports.

The Committee on Resolutions reported as follows:

The success of the Second Annual Convention of the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland is due not only to the cordial support of its own members and guests, but is due also, in large measure, to its friends in Philadelphia, who have provided for its meetings and extended their hospitality to all of its members.

The Committee on Resolutions recommend that the Convention vote its hearty thanks to each of the following:

The Provost and University of Pennsylvania who have given us a home, and who are yet to give us of their bounty;

The Principal and Trustees of the Philadelphia High School who have lent us their spacious auditorium;

And, particularly, the local committee, including Professors Ames and Edmonds and their associates, who have labored with success to make it pleasant and profitable for us to be here.

EMMA G. SEBRING,
JAMES F. BALDWIN.

Resolution adopted.

Upon motion adjourned.

After adjournment a luncheon was given to the members of the Association by the University of Pennsylvania in Houston Hall.

LUCY M. SALMON,
President.

E. H. CASTLE,
Secretary.

LIST OF MEMBERS

Abbe, Mrs. Robert,	City History Club,	New York City.
Abelson, Paul,	De Witt Clinton High School,	New York City.
Ames, Herman V.,	University of Pennsylvania,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Anderson, Bingley,	The Misses Masters School,	Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
Andrews, Elizabeth A.,	Miss Baldwin's School,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Arnold, Isabel F.,	Plainfield Seminary,	Plainfield, N. J.
Babcock, Earle B.,	Ethical Culture School,	New York City.
Balch, Elizabeth,	St. Agnes School,	Albany, N. Y.
Baldwin, Blanche,	High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Baldwin, Florence,	Miss Baldwin's School,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Baldwin, James F.,	Vassar College,	Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
Barnard, J. Lynn,	Ursinus College,	Collegeville, Pa.
Barrett, Martha B.,	De Witt Clinton High School,	New York City.
Bates, A. B.,	Morris High School,	New York City.
Belcher, Katharine F.,	Newark High School,	Newark, N. J.
Bergen, Kate A.,	High School,	Jamaica, N. Y.
Boynton, George E.,	Erasmus Hall High School,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Brewer, Margaret H.,	Western District High School,	Washington, D. C.
Briggs, Elizabeth,	Dr. Sachs's School,	New York City.
Brown, Marshall S.,	New York University,	New York City.
Brownell, Jane L.,	Miss Baldwin's School,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Brush, W. F.,		
Burr, George L.,	Cornell University,	Ithaca, N. Y.

Butler, Arthur P.,	Morristown School,	Morristown, N. J.
Butler, Eliza R.,	Horace Mann School,	New York City.
Campbell, Grace B.,	Private School,	New York City.
Campbell, James O.,	Westminster College,	New Wilmington, Pa.
Carhart, Elizabeth M.,	Brooklyn Heights Seminary,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Carpenter, Leonora E.,	Eastern High School,	Baltimore, Md.
Carrell, Theodora M.,	Buffalo Seminary,	Buffalo, N. Y.
Carrs, Elizabeth,	Charlton School,	New York City.
Cartwright, Otho G.,	Horace Mann School,	New York City.
Castle, Edward H.,	Teachers College,	New York City.
Chapin, Nelly A.,	St. Agatha School,	New York City.
Chapman, Lena M.,	High School,	Amsterdam, N. Y.
Chapman, Mildred B.,	High School,	Hammonton, N. J.
Chatfield, Hazen,	Public School 36,	New York City.
Chesley, Mabel,	Fulton High School,	Fulton, N. Y.
Cheyney, Edward P.,	University of Pennsylvania,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Clark, Belle F.,	Normal School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Coffin, Howard A.,	Publisher,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Colestock, Henry T.,	State Normal School,	Mansfield, Pa.
Collins, Maria C.,	Collegiate School for Girls,	Cincinnati, O.
Conant, O. P.,	Publisher,	New York City.
Cox, W. J.,	Publisher,	New York City.
Crawford, Mary V.,	Miss Baldwin's School,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Croswell, James G.,	Brearley School,	New York City.
Curtiss, Mrs. E. S.,	Normal School,	Geneseo, N. Y.
Davidson, Martha W.,		Chester, N. Y.
Davis, B. C.,	Alfred University,	Alfred, N. Y.
Davis, Esther V.,	Girls' Commercial High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Dawson, Edgar,	Delaware College,	Newark, Del.
Dean, Sarah M.,	Brearley School,	New York City.
Dubbs, Joseph H.,	Franklin and Marshall College,	Lancaster, Pa.
Dynes, Sarah A.,	State Normal School,	Trenton, N. J.
Edmonds, Franklin S.,	Central High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Ellery, Eloise,	Vassar College,	Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
Ensign, S. Laura,	Girls' Latin School,	Baltimore, Md.
Estvan, M.,	Dr. Sachs's School,	New York City.
Evans, Jessie C.,	High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Ewing, Edith C.,	Charlton School,	New York City.
Fanning, Grace M. W.,	Manual Training High School,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Farrand, Wilson,	Newark Academy,	Newark, N. J.
Fay, C. R.,	De Witt Clinton High School,	New York City.
Fay, Mary L.,	Collegiate School,	Passaic, N. J.

Foote, Anna E.,	State Normal School,	Jamaica, N. Y.
Freeland, M. Frances,	State Normal School,	Trenton, N. J.
Freeman, Minerva,	High School,	Dover, N. J.
Gallaher, Sarah M.,	Mountain Seminary,	Birmingham, Pa.
Gambrill, J. Montgomery,	Polytechnic Institute,	Baltimore, Md.
Gardiner, Frederick,	Yeats School,	Lancaster, Pa.
Gavit, Helen E.,	The Misses Ely's School,	New York City.
Geer, Clarence J.	Shady Side Academy,	Pittsburg, Pa.
Gilmore, Arthur S.,	High School,	Williamsport, Pa.
Girls Department,	Friends' Central School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Gminder, Albert J.,	Preparatory School,	Baltimore, Md.
Godfrey, Viola E.,	Girls' Commercial High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Goodwin, Ruth S.,	Friends' Select School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Hadley, Sarah L.,	Vassar College,	Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
Haeseler, Louise H.,	High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Hall, E. R.,	Balliol School,	Utica, N. Y.
Hall, Mary,	Manual Training High School,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Harjes, Helen G.,	Girls' High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Haskins, Emily L.,	High School,	West Chester, Pa.
Herrick, Cheesman A.,	Central High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Hess, William L.,	Lakewood School,	Lakewood, N. J.
Hewitt, C. L.,	High School,	Syracuse, N. Y.
Hill, Emilie B.,	Commercial High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Hogan, Katharine E.,	Public School 58,	New York City.
Holbrook, Dwight,	Military Academy,	Ossining, N. Y.
Howland, Arthur C.,	University of Pennsylvania,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Hull, Charles H.,	Cornell University,	Ithaca, N. Y.
Hull, William I.,	Swarthmore College,	Swarthmore, Pa.
Hurley, Thomas L.,	Columbia College,	New York City.
Ives, Isabella,		
Jenkins, Mary S.,	Halsted School,	Yonkers, N. Y.
Jennison, Lynn E.,	High School,	Asbury Park, N. J.
Kelley, Frank B.,	De Witt Clinton High School,	New York City.
Kilgore, Carrie B.,	Swarthmore College,	Swarthmore, Pa.
Kimball, Elizabeth G.,	Waynesburg College,	Waynesburg, Pa.
Kingsbury, Lucie E.,	High School,	Montclair, N. J.
Knowlton, Daniel C.,	High School,	Ithaca, N. Y.
Langlor, William C.,	Pratt Institute,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Larrabee, Hadley B.,	Keuka College,	Keuka Park, N. Y.
Leach, Anna,	Emma Willard School,	Troy, N. Y.
Leete, Gertrude,	Utica Free Academy,	Utica, N. Y.
Lewis, Lucy,	High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Lingelbach, W. E.,	University of Pennsylvania,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Longstreth, Emma J.,	Commercial High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.

Lord, Eleanor L.,	Woman's College,	Baltimore, Md.
Luetscher, George D.,	George School,	George School, Pa.
Lyon, Phœbus W.,	West Jersey Academy,	Bridgeton, N. J.
Lyon, Theodore E.,	Barnard School for Girls,	New York City.
Lyttle, Eugene W.,	Regents' Office,	Albany, N. Y.
Mace, William H.,	Syracuse University,	Syracuse, N. Y.
Mackenzie, James C.,	Mackenzie School,	Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
Mac Lear, Anne B.,	Calvert School,	Wilmington, Del.
Madeira, Lucy,	High School,	Washington, D. C.
Mallette, Metta F.,	Centennial School,	Trenton, N. J.
Manning, Henrietta L.,	Kingston Academy,	Kingston, N. Y.
Mason, W. L.,	De Witt Clinton High School,	New York City.
Massinger, Elizabeth W.,	Girls' High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
McCamant, Catharine,	Blair Presbyterial Academy,	Blairstown, N. J.
McClelland, Mary A.,	State Normal School,	Albany, N. Y.
McLaughlin, Andrew C.,	Carnegie Institution,	Washington, D. C.
McVicar, J. G.,	Miltary Academy,	Montclair, N. J.
Miller, Frank H.,	De Witt Clinton High School,	New York City.
Miller, G. R.,	Superintendent of Schools,	Binghamton, N. Y.
Monroe, Paul,	Teachers College,	New York City.
Moore, Ellis W.,		Swarthmore, Pa.
Moore, Mrs. K. A.,		Hoboken, N. J.
Morey, William C.,	University of Rochester,	Rochester, N. Y.
Moriarty, Laura A.,		Albany, N. Y.
Mullan, W. G. R.,	Georgetown College,	Washington, D. C.
Munro, D. C.,	University of Wisconsin,	Madison, Wis.
Myrick, Harriet C.,		Clinton, N. Y.
Newton, C. B.,	Lawrenceville Academy,	Lawrenceville, N. J.
North, Mary,	High School,	Montclair, N. J.
North, Samuel M.,	Polytechnic Institute,	Baltimore, Md.
Noyes, Edmund S.,	High School,	Washington, D. C.
Nugent, William D.,	Publisher,	Philadelphia, Pa.
O'Connell, Eleanor C.,	High School,	Cincinnati, O.
Oliphant, C. J.,	Publisher,	New York City.
Osgood, Susan S.,	Central High School,	Binghamton, N. Y.
Paine, Frederick H.,	Eastern District High School,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Patterson, B. F.,	Superintendent,	Pottsville, Pa.
Pearson, Henry C.,	Horace Mann School,	New York City.
Peck, Paul F.,	State Normal School,	Bloomsburg, Pa.
Perkins, Clarence,	High School,	Bloomfield, N. J.
Perry, W. H.,	Lowville Academy,	Lowville, N. Y.
Rawson, Edward B.,	Friends' Seminary,	New York City.
Renningeo, Warren D.,	Perkiomen Seminary,	Pennsburg, Pa.
Rex, Percival T.,	Friends' Central School,	Philadelphia, Pa.

Ricker, Ella V.,	State Normal School,	Baltimore, Md.
Ripton, B. H.,	Union College,	Schenectady, N. Y.
Robinson, James H.,	Columbia University,	New York City.
Robinson, P. O.,	High School of Commerce,	New York City.
Sachs, Julius,	Teachers College,	New York City.
Salmon, Lucy M.,	Vassar College,	Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
Scales, C. L. G.,	State Normal School,	Oswego, N. Y.
Schuyler, Livingston R.,	College of the City of New York,	New York City.
Scott, Austin,	Rutgers College,	New Brunswick, N. J.
Scripture, Arthur M.,	High School,	New Hartford, N.Y.
Sebring, Emma G.,	St. Agatha School,	New York City.
Shenk, Hiram H.,	Lebanon Valley College,	Annville, Pa.
Shepherd, Fred S.,	Superintendent,	Asbury Park, N. J.
Sheppard, James J.,	High School of Commerce,	New York City.
Shipley, Hannah T.,	The Misses Shipley's School,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Shotwell, James T.,	Columbia University,	New York City.
Sill, H. A.,	Cornell University,	Ithaca, N. Y.
Smith, William R.,	Bryn Mawr College,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Spangler, Henry T.,	Ursinus College,	Collegeville, Pa.
Spaulding, Randall,	Superintendent,	Montclair, N. J.
Spayd, Henry H.,	Principal,	Minersville, Pa.
Speakman, Mrs. A. W.,	Friends' Central School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Stevens, Ellen Y.,	Brooklyn Heights Seminary,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Stevens, Romiett,	Pratt Institute,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Stewart, Mary,	Commercial High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Stryker, Florence E.,	National Park Seminary,	Forest Glen, Md.
Sullivan, James,	High School of Commerce,	New York City.
Swetland, Roger W.,	Peddie Institute,	Hightstown, N. J.
Taylor, James P.,	Colgate Academy,	Hamilton, N. Y.
Taylor, Jane I.,	Wadleigh High School,	New York City.
Temple, Henry,	Washington and Jefferson College,	Washington, D. C.
Thompson, Annie S.,	High School,	Flushing, N. Y.
Thompson, Clara M.,	Wilford High School,	Baltimore, Md.
Thompson, Frederick L.,	Dr. Sachs's School,	New York City.
Thompson, W. P.,	Superintendent,	Ardmore, Pa.
Thorp, Anna F. M.,	High School,	Paterson, N. J.
Tolson, William H.,	Principal,	Baltimore, Md.
Tracy, Charles A.,	Military Institute,	Bordentown, N. J.
Trask, T. C.,	High School of Commerce,	New York City.
Travis, A. Lincoln,	Classical School,	Syracuse, N. Y.
Umsted, Mary G.,	Commercial High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Van Dyke, Paul,	Princeton University,	Princeton, N. J.

Van Sickle, J. H.	Superintendent,	Baltimore, Md.
Very, Edith,	Brearley School,	New York City.
Walker, Amasa,	Publisher,	New York City.
Ware, Moses W.,	Morristown School,	Morristown, N. J.
Welch, Fannie F.,	High School,	Passaic, N. J.
Whitson, Hannah,	High School,	Swarthmore, Pa.
Wickes, W. K.,	High School,	Syracuse, N. Y.
Willis, Henry,	Central High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Wilson, James F.,	High School of Commerce,	New York City.
Wolfson, Arthur M.,	De Witt Clinton High School,	New York City.
Wood, Elizabeth C.,	Wadleigh High School,	New York City.
Wood, Nellie A.,	Kingston Academy,	Kingston, N. Y.
Woodman, Anna S.,	Kent Place,	Summit, N. J.
Wright, Mary E.,	Kent Place,	Summit, N. J.
Wright, R. H.,	City College,	Baltimore, Md.
Young, Ella,	Halsted School,	Yonkers, N. Y.

Members are requested to notify the Secretary of changes or corrections in addresses, or omissions.

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL, 1904–5

President
J. H. VAN SICKLE
Baltimore

Vice-President
M. S. BROWN
New York University

Secretary-Treasurer
E. H. CASTLE
Teachers College, Columbia University

LUCY M. SALMON
Vassar College

C. H. HULL
Cornell University

C. A. HERRICK
Central High School, Phila.

C. J. GEER
Shady Side Academy

P. O. ROBINSON
High School of Commerce
New York City